Storer, R. (2017). “Shakespeare appears in the character of the modern Prometheus”: C. M. Ingleby and Victorian Shakespeare Controversies. *Victorians: A Journal of Culture and Literature*. 131(1), pp. 1-12, doi: 10.1353/vct.2017.0003

‘Shakespeare appears in the character of the modern Prometheus’: C. M. Ingleby and Victorian Shakespeare Controversies

Richard Storer

In a public lecture given towards the end of his career in 1974, I. A. Richards, a distinguished name in the history of twentieth-century Anglo-American criticism, made the extravagant claim that ‘if half of Shakespeare’s correspondence were discovered’ he would ‘burn it – *unread*’. It is a claim that his biographer, who describes the whole lecture as a ‘diatribe against scholarship’, considers particularly ill-judged: ‘This did not shock – it simply appeared disrespectful’ (Russo 667). Certainly it is hard to imagine Richards garnering many sympathetic nods from his Cambridge audience at the suggestion of burning Shakespearean documents. The very lecture series he had been invited to give, the Clark Lectures at Trinity College, had been endowed by one of the leading Shakespeare editors of the nineteenth century, W. G. Clark. But perhaps what Richards was really trying to do, albeit rather uncertainly (Russo notes the lectures were under-prepared), was rediscover in the 1970s the rhetorical emphases which had helped to make his name in the 1920s, which in turn had derived much of their force from a repudiation of nineteenth-century practices. Richards had begun his influential *Principles of Literary Criticism* (1924) by dismissing all previous critical traditions as ‘The Chaos of Critical Theories’; and he had used an epigraph from Shakespeare to enforce his point about the nineteenth-century legacy being unfit for purpose in the twentieth: ‘Oh monstrous! But one half-pennyworth of bread to this intolerable deal of sack!’ This

was a more general perspective that even in the 1970s an academic audience might well have remembered and identified with. It was after all not just criticism that had invented itself as 'New' in the first half of the twentieth century. Literary modernism had appealed in a similar way; and in Renaissance studies the movement now known as the 'New Bibliography' had gained prominence by denouncing the older generation of 'arm-chair editors' whose inadequate methods afforded 'amusement to the learned world.' (W.W. Greg, qtd. in Murphy 214). Looking back from the twenty-first century we are now perhaps more interested in seeing the modern in the Victorian, and in constructing narratives of continuity rather than disjunction between nineteenth and twentieth. But the idea of a disjunction is still in many ways constitutive of our sense of the 'Victorian'. And from this perspective few aspects of Victorian intellectual culture seem to stand out more clearly as disjunct from our own - *of* their age but definitely *not* for all time - than Victorian Shakespeare scholarship.

Two series of events especially invite this perspective. The first began in 1852, when John Payne Collier, one of the leading Shakespeare editors of the period, claimed to have discovered in the 'Perkins Folio' an extensive set of mid-seventeenth century annotations of the Folio text – annotations which appeared to sanction changes to the text on an unprecedented scale, but which were discovered seven years later to be forgeries, apparently by Collier's own hand. The second began a decade or so later, in 1873-4, when the New Shakspere Society was launched by F. J. Furnivall, with an ambitious agenda to reorganise Shakespeare studies. The credibility of this venture was soon compromised by a series of public rows, first between Furnivall and the poet Swinburne, then between Furnivall and Halliwell-Phillipps, the leading figure in Shakespeare biography, and ultimately between Furnivall and a larger group of

eminent scholars, who announced their collective resignation in *The Athenaeum* in 1881. These events inevitably seemed to bring Shakespearean debate into disrepute: '[T]he very name of Shakespeare is made a terror to me' Robert Browning, the Society's honorary president, wrote in March 1881 'by the people who, just now, are pelting each other under my nose, and calling themselves his disciples all the while' (Peterson 188). Such public exposure does not, of course, fairly represent the extraordinary industry and expertise of individual scholars (including even Collier) working on Shakespearean projects during the nineteenth century. Even so it is hard to identify an outstanding achievement to set against the more disreputable or comic impression. In a recent essay Christopher Decker lists the 'nineteenth century's many legacies in Shakespeare editing' (32) but admits that 'they are not of the magnitude of what Steevens, Capell, and Malone had achieved in the previous century' (33). Mark Hollingsworth also tries to be generous, claiming specifically that 'the work of the New Shakspere Society was important and all subsequent scholarship owes them a debt. They expanded and catalogued the arena of Shakespeare studies, and much of the sequence and evolution they found in Shakespeare's works – such as *The Tempest* being the final play – is now widely accepted in academia.' (Hollingsworth 41). Unfortunately this estimate of the 'debt' does not really stand up to scrutiny. It had been known from the beginning of the century that *The Tempest* must be a late play (Taylor 171); and the more general claim that the Society 'expanded and catalogued the arena of Shakespeare studies' is also misleading, if by 'arena' one understands a broad view of Shakespeare-related activity. The New Shakspere Society actually excluded from its focus most of the ways in which Shakespeare was being engaged with in the nineteenth century. It had little interest in popular editions of the texts, or in contemporary interpretations of the plays in the theatre or in literature. What it did

'expand' to a certain extent, by its programme of publications, was access to documents contemporary with Shakespeare; and what it catalogued with some success was allusions to Shakespeare in such documents. This work was recently described by Stanley Wells as 'badly out of date but still useful' (Edmondson and Wells 259), and this seems the more likely verdict of history on the Society's efforts.

C. M. (Clement Mansfield) Ingleby (1823-1886) was the editor of the first collation of such Shakespeare allusions, *Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse* (1874). A well respected figure in the field, Ingleby had an interesting alternative name for what I have called Victorian Shakespeare scholarship. In 1853 we find him writing to thank Collier for his recent *Notes and Emendations to the text of Shakespeare's Plays* (based on the Perkins Folio) and hailing it as 'a very great acquisition to Shakespearean literature' (Freemans 627). Much later, in 1880, a similar term appears in a letter to Aldis Wright, W. G. Clark's colleague and co-editor of Shakespeare at Trinity: 'It is most unfortunate for Shakespeare Literature that our headstrong and indiscrete friend Furnivall is running his ship into most dangerous waters, with his insulting letters and behaviour'.[1] In both cases it is clear that by 'literature' Ingleby meant scholarship itself, or the collective knowledge and affairs of those engaged in the study of Shakespeare. He did not mean the imaginative writing, typified by Shakespeare's works, which we would normally associate with the term 'literature' - the writing which we might think of as the *focus* of scholarship but distinct from it. Ingleby's perspective on 'Shakespeare literature' thus seems quite different from ours on 'Victorian Shakespeare'. He worked in one corner only of what we now see as a very broad field of Shakespeare-related activity in the nineteenth century, encompassing all kinds of cultural practices, imaginative 'appropriations' of Shakespeare in poetry and

fiction, and realisations of Shakespeare in the theatre and other arts. Ingleby's term seems designed to exclude much of this activity from the category of what was most worthwhile in the appreciation of Shakespeare, as his use of the related term *literate* at the end of the following quotation suggests. For Ingleby, the popular Shakespeare was never the real Shakespeare:

> If, as Mr Charles Knight concludes, "he [Shakespeare] was *always* in the heart of his people" . . . that fact speaks more for Shakespeare as a showman than for Shakespeare as a man of genius. Doubtless he knew his men: but assuredly his men did not know him. The drift of his plays was in a manner intelligible, or they would not have been entertaining, to the penny-knaves who pestered the Globe and Blackfriars Theatres. But his profound reach of thought and unrivalled knowledge of human nature were as far beyond the vulgar ken, as were the higher graces of his poetry. It is to men of sensibility and education that Shakespeare appeals as a man of genius; and it is to the literate class we must look for the impress of that genius. (*Centurie* xv)

This way of thinking of Shakespeare as being only being truly accessible to an elite group (of 'men'), distinguishing the 'showman' from the 'genius', and caricaturing theatre audiences as pestering 'penny-knaves', seems to flout just about every modern critical orthodoxy one can think of. So perhaps it is not too surprising that recent studies of 'Victorian Shakespeare' pay very little attention to the work of Ingleby and his colleagues.[2] In this essay I want to suggest that that it is, nevertheless, still worth revisiting Victorian 'Shakespeare literature', and particularly worth focussing on Ingleby, who is usually never more than a peripheral figure. My intention is not to

retell the two main stories in detail, as this has been usefully done already, but to suggest that these episodes, comical and distant as they now seem, belong to a longer narrative of the professionalization of literary study to which modern scholars, teachers and critics, whether of Shakespeare or the Victorians, still belong.[3]

As the letters already quoted indicate, C. M. Ingleby was an observer and participant in both the Collier and Furnivall episodes, and his career conveniently links the two, which are more often treated separately. His most notable contribution to the former was *A Complete View of the Shakspere Controversy* (1860), a powerful collation of all the evidence against Collier, which is usually regarded as having finally established, after much previous debate, that the Perkins annotations were modern forgeries and that Collier was responsible for them. Ingleby is thus assured of a part in any reconstruction of the Collier affair. None of the main accounts, however, see beyond his 'fearsomely methodical' exposure of forgery (Freemans 820) to what makes him a more interesting and representative figure in 'Shakespeare literature'. In Samuel Schoenbaum's account in *Shakespeare's Lives*, Ingleby is drawn as an almost sociopathic character, totally focussed on the elimination of Collier. He is referred to several times as Collier's 'nemesis'; and Schoenbaum quotes from some manuscript notes left by Ingleby which add to the sense that what made him such an effective destroyer of Collier's reputation was that he was not quite human: 'on the whole I dislike my kind, and my natural affections are weak' (357). Arthur and Janet Ing Freeman echo Schoenbaum's characterisation of Ingleby as 'nemesis' (626) and describe him as a 'hard man' (629). But they also concede that Dewey Ganzel (whose pro-Collier account they are usually at pains to refute) is 'probably fair' (627) in his summing up of Ingleby's motivation. Ganzel introduces Ingleby as someone

who ‘initially . . . had little or no interest in Shakespeare’ and adds: ‘his concern with literature was ratiocinative rather than aesthetic or critical, and his interest in the Perkins Folio had more to do with the puzzle of the book’s provenance than with the quality of its emendations’ (214).

If we take Ingleby’s whole career into account it becomes clear that he was even from the start a much more committed Shakespearean than Ganzel’s narrative needs him to be. He was not simply drawn into the Collier affair as a kind of detective, or legal counsel. In the early 1850s Ingleby, who was working for his father’s law firm in Birmingham, was certainly a relative newcomer to Shakespeare scholarship. But he was already devoting much of his time to writing on literary and philosophical topics; and as a Cambridge graduate his intellectual training had been essentially the same as that of the ‘Cambridge Shakespeare’ editors Clark and Wright. The issue that drew him into the Collier affair was precisely the question of ‘quality of . . . emendations’; and he continued to reflect and pronounce on this topic long after the affair was over.

All Shakespeare editors have to address the issue of when and how to ‘emend’ particular lines in the plays which seem, in the printed source texts, to be defective or obscure. By the 1850s many scholarly editors, including Collier in his 1842-44 edition, had become quite conservative in their approach to this issue. But in 1852 Collier surprised his colleagues by introducing a new element into the equation. He announced that he had come into possession of a copy of the 1632 Second Folio which was extensively annotated by an unknown hand that he believed to date from the mid-seventeenth century, a period almost within living memory of Shakespeare himself. The book became known as the ‘Perkins Folio’ because of the inscription

'Tho. Perkins his Booke' found inside it; but more significantly Collier dubbed the unknown author of the annotations 'the old corrector' – a title which endowed the annotator (and his promoter, Collier) with unprecedented authority to emend the text, turning conjectural emendation into authentic 'correction'. The publication of these annotations might not have generated so much controversy if it had been taken as just another scholarly resource, like the allusions which Ingleby later collated, documenting seventeenth century engagement with Shakespeare's works. As we have already seen, Ingleby actually wrote to Collier to thank him for this contribution to 'Shakespearean literature'. What aroused suspicion was that from the start Collier claimed much more for his new source. He asserted that the Perkins emendations revealed 'the restored language of Shakespeare' (xxvi), and that it was 'impossible' to regard them as (like the emendations of other editors) 'purely conjectural' - they must be based on 'a higher authority' (xxiv). Collier followed up his publication of the annotations with a new edition of Shakespeare's works, for a wider market, incorporating many new emendations suggested by the old corrector's notes but not marking these in any way, so that the extensively emended text appeared as if it was simply the received text. Ingleby was particularly vehement in response to this development, charging Collier with having 'changed the whole face of Shakespeare . . . without marking a single change' and with 'a readiness to substitute on an unknown authority the most tasteless, and at times the most meaningless readings for the staple beauties of the bard' (qtd. in Ziegler 217).

It was not forgery as such, then, but Collier's 'readiness' to emend Shakespeare's text that provoked Ingleby. After *The Complete View* his next Shakespeare book, *The Still Lion* (1874), was an extended essay on the professional ethics of emendation:

> Conjectural criticism is legitimate; for it is needful to the perfection of the text: but no critic can be licensed to exercise it whose knowledge and culture do not guarantee these two great pre-requisites: (1) a competent knowledge of the orthography, phraseology, prosody, as well as the language of arts and customs, prevalent in the time of Shakespeare; (2) a refined and reverent judgment for appreciating his genius and learning. (*Still Lion* 11)

It is unlikely that many of Ingleby's contemporaries (even Collier himself before 1852) would have radically disagreed with these principles. Ingleby's formulations are perhaps more unusual in acknowledging the conservative ideology determining his attitude to editing. What was at stake for Ingleby was not just a matter of aesthetics, preserving the 'staple *beauties* of the Bard'. The English language itself depended on Shakespeare's preservation. Summing up the case against Collier in *The Complete View* he made this broader context explicit: 'The texts of Shakspere and of the English Bible have been justly regarded as the two river-heads of our vernacular English . . . To the texts of Shakspere and of our Bible we must cleave, if we would save our language from deterioration. Yet it is one of those texts that a tasteless and incompetent peddler [ie Collier] has attempted to corrupt throughout its wide and fertile extent' (*Complete View* 324-5). As George Yeats notes (473-4), metaphors of *corruption*, which were popular with eighteenth-century Shakespeare editors as a way of describing problems with the early printed texts, began to be used in the mid-nineteenth century to describe the effects of the editing process itself. Ingleby applies the metaphor in just this way: editorial emendation threatens to corrupt the Shakespearean heritage, and by extension the national language. If scholarship was

not able to solve a textual puzzle in a line in the Folio (Ingleby's preferred source) in a way which met his demanding criteria, it was better that the line should remain incomprehensible, until future scholarship could do justice to it, rather than be subjected to a less valid emendation simply to enable readers to make sense of it.

In the introduction to *The Still Lion* Ingleby introduced a more striking metaphor to convey this idea about emendation, by appropriating a figure from classical mythology that had been particularly appealing to earlier generations of Romantic writers: 'It is here' he suggested, reflecting on the risks of emendation, 'that Shakespeare appears in the character of the modern Prometheus' (x).[4] All teachers of nineteenth-century literature are now familiar with the phrase 'the modern Prometheus' as the subtitle of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein; or The Modern Prometheus* (1818). But as the canonization of *Frankenstein* was largely a twentieth-century phenomenon, it is unlikely Ingleby was aware of this earlier use. His model (as it had been for Goethe, Byron and P. B. Shelley) was the Ancient Greek tragedy, Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*; and it was the opening scene of this drama he had in mind, in which a silent Prometheus, having angered Zeus by bringing fire to man, is fastened to a mountainside by two figures named Strength and Force. In Ingleby's analogy, Shakespeare appears as the modern Prometheus because he too 'has committed the heinous offence of endowing men with . . . the blaze of the fire of genius' (x). Zeus corresponds to 'Persistent Conventionality', and Strength and Force (renamed Dulness and Ignorance by Ingleby) to publishers and the press, agents of a critical taste that reveres Shakespeare but cannot tolerate the mysteries of his text: 'The English of Shakespeare in ten thousand places is not what now passes for good English; therefore say the censors, it must be made good English . . . The sluice is thus opened, and

Shakespeare's language is inundated . . .' (x). Ingleby here reverts to his old metaphor of wholesale emendation as ecological disaster. What makes his Prometheus parallel more distinctive is his interpretation of the other character in Aeschylus' scene, the minor god Hephaestus (Vulcan), who is reluctantly co-opted by Strength and Force to apply his craftsmanship to manacling Prometheus. For Ingleby, Hephaestus represents 'Philology', the kind of expert knowledge of language and history that he had desiderated as necessary for legitimate emendation. Philology has been 'perverted and degraded' into playing a part in the abuse of Shakespeare's text by illegitimate emendation and modernisation. But such expertise will also play a part in the future in undoing this damage: 'It is to the strong-armed and gentle-hearted Hephaestus that we must look for help . . . sooner or later those rivets will be undone . . . the idiom, idiotisms and, above all, the idiasms of Shakespeare will be thoroughly understood, and so much that goes by the board in all modern editions will be restored with intelligent reverence. This is the great work that is committed to all who have discernment or faith in the great and suffering bard' (xii).

Ingleby thus interpreted Hephaestus's role in the Prometheus myth as a parable of the role of literary scholarship, 'Philology', in a society that derived spiritual life from Shakespeare (Ingleby refers at one point to the century as 'the 19th century or 4th A.S.' (vii)). It was a parable with the familiar device of alternative outcomes. If in the past 'Philology' had not done its work with enough 'intelligent reverence', in the future it might still play a part, or even complete a 'great work', in truly mediating Shakespeare's genius. In this context what Ingleby meant by Shakespeare's 'idiotisms' is unclear. But by 'idiasms' he evidently meant expressions in the Folio which *seem* obscure and in need of emendation, but which may in fact have been

Shakespeare's own idiosyncrasies of literary style, enriching the English language although not yet fully understood by scholarship. The possibility of an idiasm, in other words, was a good reason for scholarship not to be too 'ready' with conjectural emendation. The word seems to have been Ingleby's own coinage, a transliteration from a Greek word; the first two recorded instances in the *OED* are his. If he assumed that his readers would understand 'idiasm' by recognising it from the Greek, this is another indication of how narrowly defined was his ideal Shakespearean community ('men of sensibility and education').

Despite his conservatism, which might have made him sceptical of such initiatives, Ingleby seems to have been very active in seeking to build and extend such a community – coaching Hephaestus, as it were – through networking with other scholars and supporting scholarly organisations. He was active in the Royal Society of Literature (at that time an organisation focussed on antiquarian research rather than writing) and was also an honorary member of the German Shakespeare Society. His most significant involvement was with the New Shakspere Society, however, from its foundation in 1874 to its crisis in 1881. From the first Ingleby was a leading contributor to the Society's proceedings and publications, and a member of its committee. Its emergence coincided with a particularly productive phase in his career and he channelled most of this productivity through it. He presented each member of the Society with a copy of *The Still Lion* in 1874, for example, and undertook a series of publishing projects for the society, as already noted, collating contemporary allusions to Shakespeare. The Society must have represented to Ingleby the best prospect yet of developing into an institution through which his agenda for Shakespeare could be co-ordinated and pursued. It had perhaps the potential to

become a kind of Shakespeare academy - a body capable of fulfilling the function implied by his earlier reference to conjectural emendation being 'licenced'; of policing such 'conjectural criticism' and keeping the Shakespearean 'staple' as 'pure' as possible. Ingleby's work on Shakespeare allusions can also be construed in this light: he was in effect reconstructing a kind of spiritual community of past 'men of sensibility and education' whose just appreciation of Shakespeare might act as a regulatory model for the new community.

The events of the brief period of flourishing of the New Shakspere Society have been often narrated; and in most accounts the same quotation, from an early paper given to the society by F. G. Fleay, is taken to epitomise the new organisation's platform:

> Our analysis, which has hitherto been qualitative, must become quantitative; we must cease to be empirical, and become scientific: in criticism as in other matters, the test that decides between science and empiricism, is this: 'Can you say, not only of what kind, but how much? If you cannot weigh, measure, number your results, however you may be convinced yourself, you must not hope to convince others, or claim the position of an investigator; you are merely a guesser, a propounder of hypotheses. (qtd. in Benzie 187)

Fleay does seem to have commanded the agenda for the first few months of the Society's existence. But the impression this creates, that the Society was all about subjecting Shakespeare to a battery of quasi-scientific 'tests', is probably misleading. Fleay actually resigned the society after a few months in 1874, falling out publicly with F. J. Furnivall, the self-appointed Director and real driving force behind the

Society. Furnivall was more equivocal about the value of tests, conceding that ultimately he would regard the critical judgment of Tennyson as of higher authority (Benzie 190). His characteristic emphasis was more on organising the study of the plays so that they revealed Shakespeare – conceived as both 'himself' and 'itself':

> . . . in this Victorian time, when our geniuses of Science are so wresting her secrets from Nature as to make our days memorable for ever, the faithful student of SHAKSPERE need not fear that he will be unable to pierce through the crowds of forms that exhibit SHAKSPERE's mind, to the mind itself, the man himself, and see him as he was. (qtd. in Schoenbaum 483)

In practice, knowing Shakespeare's mind meant constructing a narrative of the *development* of his mind, and for Furnivall this meant categorising the plays into groups that marked this development. This approach would be elegantly realised in Edward Dowden's popular *Shakspere: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art* (1875), but Furnivall went in for more luridly titled categories such as 'Lust-or-False-Love Group' and 'Ingratitude-and-Cursing Group' – all 'miserable nonsense' to more conventional scholars (Peterson 172). It is not surprising that such experiments, and the Furnivall-Fleay rhetoric of scientific modernity ('this Victorian time') quickly attracted comment and parody. The poet Swinburne, in particular, published several lengthy and amusing satires on the Society. In essays on Shakespeare he also challenged the judgements of some Society members on particular plays. Furnivall responded angrily, and a long public feud, conducted through pamphlets, footnotes, and published letters, ensued, lasting from 1875 to 1880. Furnivall dubbed Swinburne 'Pigsbrook', translating the apparent Old English elements in his surname.

Swinburne responded by naming Furnivall as 'Brothelsdyke' (translating from Latin); and in poems circulated to his friends even apparently called Furnivall 'Fartiwell' and the Society the 'Shitspeare Society'.[5]

Besides Fleay's scientific pretensions, and Furnivall's esoteric grouping of Shakespeare's plays, it is for this row between Swinburne and Furnivall that the New Shakspere Society is chiefly remembered. Unedifying as it was, it does seem to be symbolic of more significant tensions – as is even suggested by the different linguistic specialisms the antagonists chose to frame their insulting names for each other (Old English versus Latin). As Oscar Maurer suggests, the row is 'important' for bringing into focus 'the problem of the relative worth of scholarly, historical, linguistic, analytical judgments' [everything Ingleby desiderated as 'Philology'] 'as opposed to judgements called intuitive, emotional, instinctive, synthetic' (Maurer 86). It is also important, however, to be clear that this row was not in itself what caused the resignation of many of the Society's leading members in 1881. Scholars like Ingleby, Wright and others may have found the behaviour of Furnivall ('our headstrong and indiscrete friend') irritating. But Swinburne was no Tennyson, and they did not feel embarrassed by his criticisms. Nor is there any reason to think they ever whole-heartedly subscribed to the Fleay-Furnivall platform, though for a while they tolerated Furnivall's insistence on the 'Shakspere' spelling and adopted it in some of their own publications. What caused the crisis of confidence in the society, in early 1881, was Furnivall's extension of his feud with Swinburne to James Orchard Halliwell-Phillipps, one of the most respected figures in Victorian 'Shakespeare Literature', who was abused in print by Furnivall as 'the Co of Pigsbrook and Co', dismissed for his 'porcine vagaries', and lampooned as the leader of the 'woodenhead' school of

Shakespeare criticism. The origins of this affair are too complex to explore here (for a detailed account see Benzie; also Peterson). But the effect on other scholars is worth noting. As the two antagonists escalated their row in pamphlets and published correspondence, a storm of private correspondence accompanied it, members of the society expressing their outrage at Furnivall's language and debating with each other whether they could continue their association with the society. In the eye of this storm was Ingleby. Archives of correspondence at Trinity College, Cambridge, and in the Folger Library, show that he was negotiating with almost everyone involved: first trying to get Furnivall to apologise; then threatening to resign; and finally orchestrating the collective resignation that was announced in the *Athenaeum* at the end of April 1881. Discussing a draft statement with Wright, Ingleby identified a sentence he wanted to borrow from another letter that Wright had shown him: 'If the Society has no organisation capable of putting a stop to the use of such language by its Director, it is not a Society to which a gentleman can belong.' This, Ingleby noted, 'exactly hits off the state of the case'.[6] Members of the society reacted against Furnivall's verbal attack on Halliwell-Phillipps as if he had violated an unspoken code on which the organisation was premised. But while they expressed this in terms of being a 'gentleman', what they had in mind does not seem that different from what we might describe as a 'professional' code.

Ingleby himself is easily mistaken for the opposite of a 'professional' - a gentlemanly amateur scholar, of a kind that is always imagined to be just on the point of disappearance. He never worked for a university, for example. He retired from the law and lived comfortably at Valentines, a mansion and estate in Ilford, Essex, which his wife had inherited, dividing his time between the British Museum library and his

own library at home. Everything in Ingleby's career can nevertheless be seen as a contribution to an ongoing process of professionalization in scholarship. He objected to Collier's risk-taking entrepreneurism, stigmatizing it as 'peddling' for profit. He wanted to codify and 'licence' the necessary Shakespearean task of emendation. He supported new scholarly organisations and only reluctantly withdrew from the New Shakspere Society (convening a *de facto* smaller group in the process), not because it represented a too organised approach to Shakespeare, but because it was not organised enough: Furnivall's volatility and rule-breaking had sabotaged the collectivism of the enterprise.

Ingleby's personal legacy should perhaps be considered his appropriation of the Prometheus myth – or more precisely the Prometheus and Hephaestus myth – to this emerging professional context. It is a much more productive way of thinking about the intrinsic tensions of the process than any of the other more polarising labels (aesthetic, scientific, 'woodenhead', 'guesser') that we have seen generated by it. In literary study, all commentators – whether scholar, teacher, or critic – inevitably aspire in some way to be Prometheus, the bringer of fire (excitement and illumination). Even I. A. Richards, preferring to burn rather than read Shakespeare's letters, was in his own way proposing to bring fire – for what he thought of as a good end, the liberation of criticism from scholarship. But who brings the fire, and who brings the iron? The role of Prometheus, in principle, is always already taken – by Shakespeare, or the literary work or author being studied – and so the professional commentator is thrown back on the role of Hephaestus, the craftsman, whose skills may be employed either to constrain the work or liberate it. These roles were as contested and difficult to distinguish in the nineteenth century as they still are in the twenty-first, and

however much we may want to distance ourselves from Victorian 'Shakespeare Literature' this is one bond we still have with it.

NOTES

1: C. M. Ingleby to Aldis Wright, 24 June 1880; unpublished letter in the Library of Trinity College, Add. Ms.c.69.169.

2: For a useful survey of 'Victorian Shakespeare' work over the last two decades, see Marshall 2-7.

3: For the Perkins Folio controversy, see the very detailed account by Freeman and Freeman; also Yeats for an interesting analysis of the affair in the context of Victorian reverence for Shakespeare. For the New Shakspere Society, see Benzie; Peterson; Murphy; and Sawyer. For basic information about Ingleby's life, the best source is the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, but an interesting source that has recently come to light is a volume of Ingleby's *Poems and Epigrams* (1887), printed for private circulation after his death, that includes a memoir by his son. This book is unknown to the British Library, but a copy owned by Cornell University has now been digitised and can be found online.

4: In 1874 *The Still Lion* appeared with an epigraph from Aeschylus's *Prometheus Unbound* followed by the Prometheus essay under the heading 'Justification of the Greek Motto'. This edition was a special one presented to all members of the New Shakspere Society. When the book was published for wider

circulation in 1875, Ingleby removed the epigraph and 'Justification' essay. But he then reprinted the essay as 'The Modern Prometheus' in *Shakespeare: The Man and The Book* (1877).

5: 'Fartiwell' and 'Shitspeare' are mentioned in several recent narratives in which Furnivall appears (see for example Murphy 211; Hawkes 121). But the origin of these names seems to await rediscovery. The source that is always cited is Benzie (202); but Benzie's source is Peterson (167), and Peterson does not specify either a printed or archival source, noting only that the phrase was used in 'scatalogical verses privately distributed' among Swinburne's friends.

6: C. M. Ingleby to Aldis Wright, 19 March 1881. Unpublished letter in the Library of Trinity College, Add MS.c.69.167. The letter noted by Ingleby was addressed to Wright from James Spedding, the eminent Bacon scholar, who had died ten days earlier. His statement was quoted in *The Athenaeum* on 26 March 1881 – thus the editor of Bacon spoke from beyond the grave to rebuke the promoter of Shakespeare. The resignation of Ingleby and others (including E. A. Abbott, Leslie Stephen, Henry Sidgwick, and the Duke of Devonshire) was announced in *The Athenaeum* on 30 April 1881.

WORKS CITED

Benzie, William. *Dr F. J. Furnivall: Victorian Scholar Adventurer*. Norman, Oklahoma: Pilgrim Books, 1983.

Collier, John Payne. *Notes and Emendations to the Text of Shakespeare's Plays, from early manuscript corrections in a copy of the Folio, 1632*. London: Whittaker, 1853.

Decker, Christopher. 'Shakespeare editions'. Marshall, 16-38.

Edmondson, Paul, and Stanley Wells. *Shakespeare Beyond Doubt: Evidence, Argument, Controversy*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013.

Freeman, Arthur, and Janet Ing Freeman. *John Payne Collier: Scholarship and Forgery in the Nineteenth Century*. 2 vols. New Haven: Yale UP, 2004.

Ganzel, Dewey. *Fortune and Men's Eyes: The Career of John Payne Collier*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1982.

Hawkes, Terence. *Shakespeare in the Present*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Hollingsworth, Mark. 'Shakespeare Criticism'. Marshall, 39-59

Ingleby, C. M. *A Complete View of the Shakspere Controversy, concerning the authenticity and genuineness of manuscript matter affecting the works and biography of Shakspere, published by Mr. J. Payne Collier as the fruits of his researches*. London: Natali and Bond, 1861.

---. *The Still Lion: An Essay towards the Restoration of Shakespeare's Text*. London: Trubner, 1874.

---. (Ed.) *Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse; Being Materials for a History of Opinion on Shakespeare and his Works, Culled from Writers of the first Century after his Rise*. London: Trubner, 1874.

---. *Poems and Epigrams by Clement Mansfield Ingleby, with a short memoir by his son.* London: Trubner, 1887.

Marshall, Gail, ed. *Shakespeare in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2012.

Maurer, Oscar. 'Swinburne vs Furnivall: A Case Study in "Aesthetic" vs "Scientific" Criticism'. *University of Texas Studies in English* XXXI (1952), 86-96.

Murphy, Andrew. *Shakespeare in Print: A History and Chronology of Shakespeare Publishing*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.

Peterson, William Samuel, ed. *Browning's Trumpeter*: *The Correspondence of Robert Browning and Frederick J. Furnivall 1872-1889*. Washington: Decatur House, 1979.

Richards, I. A. *Principles of Literary Criticism*. International Library of Psychology, Philosophy and Scientific Method. London: Kegan Paul, 1924.

Russo, John Paul. *I. A. Richards: His Life and Work.* London: Routledge, 1989.

Sawyer, Robert. 'The New Shakspere Society, 1873-1894'. *Borrowers and Lenders: The Journal of Shakespeare and Appropriation* II.2 (2006).

Schoenbaum, Samuel. *Shakespeare's Lives.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.

Taylor, Gary. *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History from the Restoration to the Present*. London: Hogarth Press, 1990.

Yeats, George. 'Shakespeare's Victorian Legacy: Text as Monument and Emendation as Desecration in the Mid-Nineteenth Century'. *Victorian Literature and Culture* 40 (2012), 469-486.

Ziegler, Georgianna. 'A Victorian Reputation: John Payne Collier and His Contemporaries'. *Shakespeare Studies* XVII (1985), 209-234.

Leeds Trinity University